



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,862	08/28/2006	Albert Gezinus Huizing	Vereenigde P65US0	4784
7590 04/08/2009 Varnum Riddering Schmidt & Howlett Bridgewater Place P O Box 352 Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0352				
EXAMINER SOTOMAYOR, JOHN B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3662				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/549,862

Applicant(s)

HUIZING ET AL.

Examiner

John B. Sotomayor

Art Unit

3662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 27 JUN 2006

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings filed September 22, 2005 appear to be informal.
2. The drawings are objected to because the boxes in the figures should be labeled with descriptive legends. Thus the boxes in Figures 1-3 should be labeled. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed June 27, 2006 has been entered and considered. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 by the Examiner is attached.

Preliminary Amendment

4. The preliminary amendment filed September 22, 2005 has been entered and considered.

Priority

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The foreign priority data should be inserted in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The

claims are considered to be operational or quasi-method in that they recite an intended use without setting forth structure or means that would limit the claims upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 12, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. As stated in the above numbered paragraph 7, it is unclear as to what exactly is being claimed in claims 2-4, 6-9, and 12. What structure or means is being set forth in the claim?

11. Claims 3, 4, and 6 should probably include the phrase "further comprising" since it is unclear as to whether the claim is definite and/or provides sufficient or proper limitations for the plurality of time delay elements in the claims upon which they depend.

12. Claims 27 and 28 are considered to be confusing since they appear to be written awkwardly. The claims do not conform to accepted US Patent Office claim format for claiming a computer program. It is unclear and confusing as to whether claim 27 and/or

Art Unit: 3662

claim 28 are independent or dependent claims. Correction and/or clarification is required. What exactly is being claimed in claim 28? What is meant by "A data carrier..."?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775).

The claims, as best understood, are considered to be either met by the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) who show a detection system and method including, inter alia, an optical sensor, a radar device, and a signal processing for processing signals from the optical and radar device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 3662

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 10 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775).

The invention is substantially disclosed by the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775).

However it appears that the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) do not show a dish antenna.

It is submitted, and Official notice is taken, that dish antennas are well known in the radar art as a means to transmit signals.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the systems in the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) to include a dish antenna as a well known substitute for an antenna.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art show various radar systems.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Sotomayor whose telephone number is 571-

272-6978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom H. Tarcza, can be reached on 571-272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John B. Sotomayor/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3662